



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Typographical errors are not numerous; I have noted but the following: on page 34, third line of second paragraph, *correspondence* is wrongly spelled; on page 64, fourth line of second paragraph, *upon* should be read for *up*; page 96, eighth line from bottom, has the word *equipped* misplaced; on page 105, second line, the article *a* seems to have dropped out after *for*; and in the last line of page 158, *a* should be read for *an*.

Several other points are worth noting. On page 15 we have the form *Pergamum*, while on page 166 the name of the same city is given as *Pergamus*. It is surely very unorthodox to refer to a Greek and to a Latin inscription by "(3.4961)" and "(6.5076)" respectively (pp. 43, 49). One concludes ultimately, I suppose, that "I.G." and "C.I.L." are to be supplied in either case, but the omission is one sufficient to cause a mental "hold-up" of even a professional scholar. It hardly seems good form nowadays to speak of *Diana* of Ephesus (p. 41), and it is more correct to give the dates of the régime of Caracalla as 198-217 than 211-217 (p. 46). It is hard to understand the author's translation of *querelam* (p. 43) as *inscription*, when the rest of the passage is literally rendered. On pages 88 and 91 we have mention made of the Emperor *Elagabalus*. If this form is correct it must be a very rare one, the accepted spelling being of course *Elagabalus* or *Heliogabalus*. Finally, is the orthography of *traveling* and *traveled* permissible outside of a newspaper?

The chief fault to be found with the *Travel among the Ancient Romans* is its extreme poverty of style and too frequent lapses into literary slovenliness. The vocabulary employed is exceedingly limited and there is endless repetition.

Much valuable material, notwithstanding all this, has been assembled within a convenient compass; an excellent feature is the full and accurate account of references to sources, ancient and modern, which is provided at the conclusion of each chapter.

A. D. FRASER

ALLEGHENY COLLEGE

De Catulli carmine sexagesimo quarto quaestiones diversae. By L. L. SELL. Columbia dissertation. New York: W. D. Gray, 1918. Pp. 112.

The chief question discussed in this dissertation concerns "the similarities which bind together the poems of Catullus and which show that in poem 64 Catullus alludes as far as possible to a part of his own life." The thesis which the author defends is that Catullus in his soul-stirring love affair with Lesbia had sufficient background for the narration of the Ariadne story and did not need to rely on his Greek predecessors.

First the similarities in language between poem 64 and Catullus' other poems are listed. Sell recognizes that individual cases may be doubtful, but urges that the cumulative argument is sound. As the similarities to the other poems are far more numerous in the Ariadne portion, Sell argues that this portion more nearly represents Catullus' true feelings. In this connection (p. 26) a statement so extraordinary is made that I cannot but think that either Sell or I have been lost in the intricacies of the Latinity of the book. He says that of the eight passages (in the list of similarities) which are in the Peleus portion, five refer to love, and so not more than three deal with the Epithalamium (of Peleus and Thetis) properly so called. One wonders with what an epithalamium should deal if not with love and marriage.

Sell then discusses similarities of thought between the sixty-fourth and other poems, and these he thinks of greater importance. While I incline in general to the view that the language and thought of the poem is often genuinely Catullian, I cannot follow Sell in some of his fancies. Ariadne is supposed to correspond to Catullus; yet Sell argues that the deserted Ariadne is like the to-be-deserted Lesbia (8.12-19). A similar inconsistency appears when Sell compares Catullus' desire for the sympathy of a friend (Cornificius, 38.4-5) with Ariadne's ironical question (ll. 182-83): *Coniugis an fido consoler memet amore?* In a real parallel either Ariadne would be seeking the consolation of a female friend, or Catullus would be pleading ironically for the sympathy of Lesbia. Catullus and Ariadne are not even allowed to call upon the gods or do any of the other ordinary and natural things without being suspected of poetical identity. The ratiocination of Sell permits him to say that the punishment of Lesbia in being forced to stay with her *moechi* (ll. 15-17) is like Theseus' punishment in having his father commit suicide. A characteristic of Catullus is said to be *aequabilitas*, which seems to consist largely in using the preposition *pro*. The mention of *vota* in the Ariadne portion is seized upon as proof of pure Catullianism, for they are mentioned in 36.3-8 and 4.22-23. One would judge that no other Roman ever made a vow.

Sell realizes, as his predecessors in this sort of thing realized, that it is necessary to explain why Catullus, a man, should tell his love story through a woman: Catullus was a little lachrymose, it is suggested, and a woman did excellently well for the part. Besides, he did not want people to know that Ariadne was Catullus, for they might have laughed! One wonders whether there may not be a Baconian cipher in the poem: will not someone step forward and discover the name Catullus in Ariadne's words?

The difference between the Peleus and the Ariadne portions is explained by Sell in this way: the Peleus is a dream of the life that Catullus hoped to live, the Ariadne is the vivid picture of the life he had lived. The title of the piece might be *Somnium amantis decepti*. But by the same inconsistency

that we observed above Sell argues that the Ariadne too was like a dream to Catullus.

The chapter on the author of the *Dirae* and the *Lydia* (Cato?) as an imitator of Catullus is more successful. Sell makes it seem likely, though he does not prove, that it was not Catullus who was the imitator. But I must protest against some of Sell's additions to the list of imitations, e.g., Cat. 64. 195, *meas audite querellas*, and *Dirae* 50, *accipite has voces*. A chapter on alliteration in Ennius, Lucretius, Catullus (poem 64), Cato, and Virgil gives some interesting statistics. Cato and Catullus show less alliteration than the others. A final chapter deals with Virgil's imitations of Catullus 64, but the list given is by no means complete.

While Sell has, in my opinion, contributed little of value to the literature of the subject in this, his first work, and while some of his arguments seem absurd, as shown above, yet he is to be commended for his obvious zeal, earnestness, and ingenuity, qualities which may lead him to better results in other investigations.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA